

Asbury Theological Seminary ePLACE: preserving, learning, and creative exchange

Syllabi

eCommons

1-1-2005

CO 515 Forgiveness in Counseling

Virginia Todd Holeman

Follow this and additional works at: <http://place.asburyseminary.edu/syllabi>

Recommended Citation

Holeman, Virginia Todd, "CO 515 Forgiveness in Counseling" (2005). *Syllabi*. Book 2743.
<http://place.asburyseminary.edu/syllabi/2743>

This Document is brought to you for free and open access by the eCommons at ePLACE: preserving, learning, and creative exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Syllabi by an authorized administrator of ePLACE: preserving, learning, and creative exchange. For more information, please contact thad.horner@asburyseminary.edu.

CO515: Forgiveness in the Counseling Process
Fall 2005 2:30-5:15 pm Thursday

FINAL SYLLABUS: Created June 2, 2005

Instructor: Virginia Todd Holeman, Ph.D.
 E: Toddy_Holeman@asburyseminary.edu
 Class Enrollment: 30

Credit: 3 hours
 O: 859-858-2212
 Office hours: Tue, 2:30-3:30 pm; Wed 1:15-2:15 pm; Thur 10-11 am

Course Description:

This course explores the theological, psychological, and clinical components of forgiveness and reconciliation. Interpersonal and intrapersonal elements of forgiveness receive particular emphasis. Procedures for implementing forgiveness in pastoral and clinical counseling settings are reviewed.

Course Goals

At the completion of this course you will:

1. Articulate your integration of forgiveness, repentance, and reconciliation from personal experience.
2. Explicate forgiving, repenting, and reconciling processes from biblical contexts and theological perspectives.
3. Describe the psychological foundations of forgiving, repenting, and reconciling.
4. Apply counseling strategies to your own situations and to case studies.
5. Participate in class through discussions, activities, and devotionals.

Required Course Texts:

- Hargrave, T. (2001). Forgiving the Devil: Coming to terms with damaged relationships. Phoenix, AZ: Zeig, Tucker & Theisen, Inc.
- Holeman, V. T. (2004). Reconcilable Differences: Hope and Healing for Troubled Marriages. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Jones, G. (1995). Embodying Forgiveness. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans.
- Nowuen, H. J.M. (1992). The Return of the Prodigal Son. New York: Image Books.
- Shults, F. L., & Sandage, S. J. (2003). The Faces of Forgiveness. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Worthington, E.L. (2003). Forgiving and Reconciling: Bridges to Wholeness and Hope. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.

Course Readings Packet and class handout packet– purchase at Cokesbury Bookstore before class starts.

Classroom “Community Life” Assignments

Devotionals. We will begin each session with a brief devotional. Noweun’s text is the basis for our meditations. On the first day of class I will ask for volunteers to sign up and lead our devotional time together. Devotionals will run no longer than 10 minutes. I invite you to use all of the technological support that ATS has to offer to lead us into the Lord’s presence. [non-graded activity]

Course Requirements:

1. Class Discussion (White Paper and Response Summary Paper) 25%

White Paper: Students will be assigned to small groups of 4 or 5 persons per group. Twice during the course each student will present a “White Paper” (key concepts summary of approximately 900-1000 words in length) of the materials introduced in the readings for **that session** to his or her group members. Although everyone in a group is assigned the readings, only one person is responsible for creation of the week’s white paper. The White Paper will be uploaded into assigned team folders within the Course icon on First Class Client **at least 24 hours before the beginning class session**. In other words all White Papers must be uploaded in the appropriate team folder NO later than 2:15 pm on Wednesday. **A full letter grade penalty will be assessed on White Papers are posted late to the team folder or that are distributed in class.**

The purpose of the paper is to invite the rest of your team into a dialogue. A well-written white paper will:

- Engage the material accurately in a substantive way
- Challenge people to think
- Give them food for thought
- Will conclude with three or four critical thinking questions for your team to discuss

Your white paper should be:

- Typed with a 12-point font like New Times Roman
- 900-1000 words in length
- Uploaded to your team folder no later than 2:15 pm on the Wednesday before you present.

Response Summary Paper:

Following the close of each class one student per group writes a paper that summarizes the key points that came out of the White Paper and the small group discuss. A Response Summary Paper should be posted to your team folder by 2:15 pm on the Friday following the group discussion. The intent is to summarize the key ideas and insights from your team’s discussion and from the White Paper. This responsibility rotates weekly, as do the White Paper responsibilities. **A full letter grade penalty will be assessed for each day that a Response Summary Paper is late.**

- Prepared as a MS Word document or a pdf file. If you are not using MS Word, consider saving your document in Rich Text Format
- Typed with a 12-point font like New Times Roman; 900-1000 words
- Posted to your team folder as an attachment to your post.
- Subject line: Week [insert date of discussion] Summary Response Paper
- Due by 2:15 pm Friday

2. Theological Comparison and Position Paper – 25%

Due Oct. 20, 2005 -- Electronic submissions preferred and must be uploaded by 4:00 pm. ET

The purpose of this paper is to document the depth of your understanding of the theological assumptions that support our practices of repentance, forgiveness, and reconciliation. Your paper will include a discussion and comparison of the theologies presented by Jones, and Shults. You may bring other perspectives (i.e., Worthington), but your paper must deal **substantively** with the arguments presented by Jones, and Shults. You will **also** summarize your current theological assumptions and commitments in this paper.

- Length – 2500-3000 words
- Format – APA or MLS with reference list
- Type – 12 cpi font, double spaced
- Due – Oct. 20, 2005

3. Theoretical Comparison and Position Paper – 25%

Due Dec. 15, 2005 NOON

Electronic versions preferred, uploaded by NOON. Paper versions must be delivered to CPC office by noon.

The purpose of this paper is to document the depth of your understanding of the key psychological models of repentance, forgiveness, and reconciliation that we will discuss in class. Your paper will include a discussion and comparison of the psychological models of repentance, forgiveness, and reconciliation. You will also summarize your current therapeutic assumptions and commitments in this paper.

- Length – 2500-3000 words
- Format – APA or MLA with reference list
- Type – 12 cpi font, double spaced
- Due -- Dec. 15, 2005 by NOON

4. Research Paper – 25%

Due Nov. 17, 2005

Electronic versions accepted, but must uploaded BEFORE 2:15 pm.

The purpose of this paper is to allow you to explore a particular area of forgiveness in more depth. This scholarly research paper can focus on any of the following areas: pastoral care and counseling; theology; biblical studies; ethics; multicultural dimension. I have provided you with a working bibliography to help launch your literature search. You can also find a growing bibliography of the most current forgiveness publications in psychology at the following website:

www.uky.edu/~ldesh2/spsp.htm

Many authors with “in press” papers are pleased to send electronic copies of their papers to you.

- **Submit topic and working reference list by September 9, 2005**
- Length – 3500 words (excluding references)
- Format – APA or MLA
- Type – 12 cpi, font, double spaced
- Final paper due – Nov. 17, 2005

Community Practices in Class

I use many different active learning strategies in this course – in other words this is not a lecture-based class. All classes require your preparation for a serious class discussion about the readings.

There is nothing neutral about forgiveness conversation. They tend to generate some intensity because we are talking about painful things. Several ground rules will help us become a conversational community of care:

- No one needs to “fix” any one else in class. Everyone needs to be “heard” and feel that they have been “understood.”
- We will protect one another’s stories by agreeing to keep class conversations confidential.
- We will respect one another’s wisdom to refrain from disclosing some personal information that is too sensitive or too painful for class-level discussion.

We will recognize that stuff about “forgiveness” isn’t necessarily set in stone. We will listen respectfully when others have a differing experience or understanding from our own.

Grading Policies:

Attendance Policy -- If you miss more than 3 classes, you will not receive a passing grade. Asbury Seminary defines grades using the following criteria (catalog, p. 24):

A= Exceptional work: outstanding or surpassing achievement of course objectives

B= Good work: strong, significant achievement of course objectives

C= Acceptable work: essential achievement of course objectives

D= Marginal work: minimal or inadequate achievement of course objectives

F= Unacceptable work: failure to achieve course objectives

A plus (+) or minus (–) indicates positions between categories (for example, B+ = very good; C– = slightly below acceptable, etc.).

When all is said and done and all the grades are averaged together, here is the final scale of measurement:

100-96 = A

95-90 = A-

89-87 = B+

86-84 = B

83-81 = B-

80-77 = C+

76-74 = C

73-71 = C-

70-67 = D+

66-64 = D

63-61 = D-

60 and below = F

Grading Process

The Asbury Seminary School of Theology faculty has adopted the following standards for faculty grading of papers:

- ◆ Timely feedback: For assessment of student work during the course of the academic term, the expectation of “timely” feedback is met when students have their work marked, graded, and returned within one week of its submission...Moreover, when assignment “B” builds on assignment “A,” assignment “A” should be returned before assignment “B” falls due. Longer assignments are often due at the end of the term, and are not subject to this definition.
- ◆ Substantive feedback: For assessments of student work during the course of the academic term, the expectation of “substantive” feedback is met when students receive responses that alert them to what they have done well and how they might improve their performance in subsequent work.

Grading Rubrics

A grading rubric will accompany every assignment that I grade. If you review the rubric before you begin your assignment then you will know the standards that I am setting to evaluate your work.

Late Assignments and Papers

A paper or assignment that is late *without prior permission from the instructor* receives a grade but no written comments. Late papers are penalized with a 1/3 letter grade reduction for **each week** that the paper is late. No late Theoretical papers will be accepted.

Incomplete Policy

A grade of "I" denotes course work has not been completed due to an **unavoidable emergency**, which does **not** include failure to turn in course work or attending to church work or other employment. See the Asbury Seminary Catalog for further clarification.

CO515 Forgiveness in the Counseling Process

Fall 2005 Schedule

Draft: June 2, 2005

Date	Theme	Reading	White Paper & Response Summary	Written Assignments	Counseling Skills	Misc.
Week 1 Sept 8	Introduction	Worthington Ch 1 & 2				Fury to Forgiveness 1
Week 2 Sept 15	Moral & Ethical Foundations	Jones, Part I	White Paper Rounds - Dr. Holeman provides white paper. Complete negotiation for your team assignments.			Les Mes
Week 3 Sept 22	Theological Foundations I	Jones Part II	Student White Paper & Summary Paper		Mercy & Justice	
Week 4 Sept 29	Theological Foundations II	Shults & Sandage, Part II Worthington Ch. 3;	Student White Paper & Summary Paper			
Week 5 Oct 6	Embodying Forgiveness	Jones Part III Holeman, Ch 1, 2, 3	Student White Paper & Summary Paper	Research topic and working bibliography of 7-10 references Due on Oct 6	Narrative Intervention	Fury to Forgiveness (2)
Week 6 Oct 13	Confession & Repentance	Holeman , Ch 5, 6, 8; Brakenhielm (Week 7 folder)	Student White Paper & Summary Paper		Road Map	
Week 7 Oct 20	Theology Comparison and Position Papers due Oct. 20 Electronic versions preferred. Upload by 4:00 pm. Eastern Time. No class this week.					
Week 8 Oct 27	Individual Models I	Worthington, Part 2;	Student White Paper & Summary Paper		REACH	
Week 9 Nov 3	Individual Models II	Shults & Sandage, Part I & III	Student White Paper & Summary Paper		Letter of Lament	Fury to Forgiveness (3)
Week 10 Nov 10	Reconciliation Models I	Hargrave text Holeman Ch 7	Student White Paper & Summary Paper			
Week 11 Nov 17	Reconciliation Models II	Holeman 4, 9 Worthington Part III	White Paper & Summary Paper	Research Paper Due Nov. 17	Couples Forgiveness Exercise	
Week 12	Reading Week					
Week 13 Dec 1	Community Models	Volf, Battle, Holeman 4				Sister I'm Sorry
Week 14 FINALS	Theoretical Comparison and Position Paper Due by NOON on Dec. 15, 2005. Electronic versions may be uploaded to the First Class Client Course Office or paper versions may be delivered to Claire Williams. All papers due no later than 12 noon on Dec. 15, 2005.					

CO515 Fall 2005 Team Assignments

My Team Members:

Week 1 Sept 8	Everyone gets on-board; work out inevitable glitches.
Week 2 Sept 15	Groups get organized. Dr. Holeman provides first White Paper.
Week 3 Sept 22	White Paper _____ Summary _____
Week 4 Sept 29	White Paper _____ Summary _____
Week 5 Oct 6	White Paper _____ Summary _____
Week 6 Oct 13	White Paper _____ Summary _____
Week 8 Oct 27	White Paper _____ Summary _____
Week 9 Nov 3	White Paper _____ Summary _____
Week 10 Nov 10	White Paper _____ Summary _____
Week 11 Nov 17	White Paper _____ Summary _____
Week 12	Reading Week – Happy Thanksgiving
Week 13 Dec 1	White Paper _____ Summary _____
Week 14 Dec 8	White Paper _____ Summary Paper _____

Bibliography

- Al-Mabuk, R. H., Enright, R. D., & Cardis, P. A. (1995). Forgiveness education with parentally love-deprived late adolescents. Journal of Moral Education, 24, 427-444.
- Augsburger, D. (1996). Helping People Forgive. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Battle, M. (1997). Reconciliation: The Ubuntu Theology of Desmond Tutu. Cleveland, OH: The Pilgrim Press
- Baumeister, R. F. (1997). Evil: Inside human violence and cruelty. New York: W.H. Freeman.
- Bråkenhielm, C. (1993). Forgiveness. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress.
- Benner, D. G. & Harvey, R. W. (1996). Choosing the gift of forgiveness. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- Carter, L., & Minirth, F. (1997). The choosing to forgive workbook. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson.
- Crysdale, C. S. W. (1999). Embracing Travail: Retrieving the Cross Today. New York: Continuum Press.
- Cunningham, B. B. (1985). The will to forgive: A pastoral theological view of forgiving. The Journal of Pastoral Care, 39(2), 141-149.
- Doherty, W. J. (1995). Soul searching: Why psychotherapy must promote moral responsibility. New York: Basic Books.
- Downie, R. S. (1965). Forgiveness. Philosophical Quarterly, 15, 128-134.
- Flanigan, B. (1998). Forgiving yourself. New York: MacMillan.
- McFadyen, A. & Sarot, M. (2001). Forgiveness and Truth: Exploration in Contemporary Theology. New York: T & T Clark.
- Morris, D. (1998). Forgiving the dead man walking. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Patton, J. (1985). Is human forgiveness possible? A pastoral perspective. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.
- Sandage, S. J. (1998) Seeking forgiveness or saving face? Christian Counseling Today, 6, pp. 10-11, 22-24.
- Sandage, S. J. (1999). An ego-humility model of forgiveness: Theoretical foundations. Marriage and Family : A Christian Journal, 2, 259-276.

Sandage, S. J. (1999). The ego-humility model of forgiveness: Implications for couple and family dynamics and therapy. Marriage and Family: A Christian Journal, 2, 277-292.

Sandage, S. J., Aubrey, C. J., & Ohland, T. K. (1999). Weaving the fabric of community: A model for counselors and therapists. Marriage and Family: A Christian Journal, 2, 381-398.

Sandage, S. J., Hill, P. C., & Vang, H. C. (2003). Toward a multicultural positive psychology: Indigenous forgiveness and Hmong culture. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 31, 564-592.

Sandage, S. J., Worthington, E. L., Jr., Hight, T. L., & Berry, J. W. (i2000). Seeking forgiveness: Theoretical context and an initial empirical study. Journal of Psychology and Theology28, 21-34.

Seamands, S. (2003). Wounds that Heal: Bringing our Hurts to the Cross. Downers Grove, IL: InterVaristy Press.

Smedes, L. B. (1996). The art of forgiving. New York: Random House.

Raybon, P. (1996). My first white friend: Confessions on race, love, and forgiveness. New York: Penguin Books.

Volf, M. (1996). Exclusion and Embrace:A Theological Exploration of Identity, Otherness, and Reconciliation. Nashville, TN: Abingdon.

Volf, M. (2000). The social meaning of reconciliation. Interpretation: A Journal of Bible and Theology, 24, 158-172.

Wohl, M. J. A., & Branscombe, N. R. (in press). Importance of social categorization for forgiveness

Worthington, E. L., Jr. (1999). Forgiveness [Special issue]. Marriage and Family: A Christian Journal, 2(2).

Worthington, E. L., Jr. (1999). Forgiveness [Special issue]. Marriage and Family: A Christian Journal, 2(3).

Worthington, E. L., Jr. (Ed.). (1998). Dimensions of Forgiveness: Psychological Research and Theological Perspectives. Philadelphia, PA: Templeton Foundation Press.